



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

and the officers of the army and the navy have nothing in their minds—and that is natural—but the two establishments. The army sees nothing but the army, and the army's idea of an immense revenue pouring in for the uses of the government is that it makes a great reservoir for army appropriations. With some exceptions, the naval officers have the same idea. Anybody who has listened to the debate for the last day or two in the other branch of Congress will see how this exploiting of enormous appropriations for the navy is brought out. We must have a navy; and we have got to-day, practically, in actual force and strength and usefulness the second navy in the world; and yet naval officers and naval boards tell us that we need to double it.

MR. WARREN: Does the Senator believe we ought to drop from the position of second naval power? I am asking for information, because, of course, I am not interested in naval matters directly, and I should like the Senator's opinion about where we ought to stand as a nation as to our naval power.

MR. HALE: That depends something upon what other nations do. I do not object if we can keep the navy where it is and not increase it. I am not opposed to keeping it up to where it is now, although it is useless largely, and always will be. The best of it is to-day engaged in a cruise around the world, which will be very expensive and which will help to wear out the navy, and we shall be called upon to appropriate for repairs and improvements resulting from the cruise, all showing that there is no legitimate use even for the navy of the extent that we have now; but I am not for cutting it down.

Asked by Mr. Bacon if he had not said six or eight years ago that the retention of the Philippine Islands would require an increase of the navy to an extent of at least fifty per cent. greater than otherwise would have been required, Mr. Hale replied:

MR. HALE: I do not pretend to be much of a prophet, but my forecast then was wise. We have since that day more than doubled the navy, and largely on account of our acquisition—such as it is—of those foreign outside insular possessions. But I am not going into that.

I have, Mr. President, as I have said, accomplished my purpose in calling the attention of the Senate and the country to this condition and to these great increases in appropriations for the military establishment.

A general discussion as to the duty of the Senate in the matter followed. It was shown that outside the Committee on Appropriations the Senators as a rule knew nothing of the various details of the great appropriation bills which come before them. Under the present system of procedure their action is practically limited to the question as to whether or not a certain amendment to an appropriation bill is proper or improper. It was therefore suggested by Senator Bacon, who has a deep interest in the problem, that hereafter the Appropriations Committee take the Senate more into its confidence when these bills are pending, in order that the Senators may fully realize where there may be

extravagance and where it may be curbed. The remarks showed no inclination on anybody's part to go the full length of the program outlined by the *Washington Post*, nor did the appropriations, as made, find any strong defender. On the other hand, it was evident that Mr. Hale's speech had aroused his colleagues from their indifference and justifies the hope that hereafter the Senate may do something to check the extravagance to which their attention has been so forcibly called.

## New Books.

INTERNATIONAL LAW AS INTERPRETED DURING THE RUSSO-JAPANESE WAR. By F. E. Smith and N. W. Sibley. Boston: The Boston Book Company. 494 pages.

This book not only covers a wide range of the international law of war and neutrality, but considerable of that of peace. To any one who is looking for an historical introduction to the various questions that arose in the Russo-Japanese conflict, going back to the Middle Ages and Lateran Councils, to Grotius and to Vattel, including in the later periods the Napoleonic, Crimean and American Civil Wars, with frequent citations from Stowell, Scott and Hall, this work with its compendious detail will be helpful. If, however, he has read the entertaining report of Takahashi on the Chino-Japanese War and the brilliant lectures of Lawrence on "War and Neutrality in the Far East," both of which are brief and to the point, examples in their way of what the treatment of a special topic should be, he will wish that the collaborators of this volume had confined themselves more exclusively to their theme and left the introductory matter to private research.

The questions that are given particularly full treatment, and which best illustrate the methods of the authors, are those relating to the right of visitation and search, the destruction of neutral vessels, absolute and conditional contraband, blockade and the North Sea incident. There are twelve useful appendices. Special cases are taken up in connection with the violation of neutrality, wrong classification of contraband and the illegal seizure of vessels. The French and English texts of the report of the North Sea Commission are given, with a statement of the Russian and English contentions in parallel columns, a chronological account of the controversy as it developed from day to day, and a list of Russian acts of interference with neutral shipping, which is taken from the *London Times*. The authors pay high tribute to the strict manner in which Japan observed the rules of international law.

INTERNATIONAL LAW. PART II: WAR. By John Westlake, LL.D., Whewell Professor of International Law in the University of Cambridge, England. Cambridge: The University Press, 1907. 334 pages. Price, 9 shillings. American agents: G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York City.

This book is a sequel to Part I, entitled "Peace." In a preliminary chapter Professor Westlake defines pacific